2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
Virginia

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season "leaf on" imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in Virginia. In other words, "How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?" Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, OK, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, **VA**, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery "late". Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 17 Feb 06. Out of the responses received, in Virginia, 1866 of a possible 2795 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .668, for a rating of 66.8%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of "Satisfied" nudging towards a rating of "Neither Satisfied or Unsatisfied". The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is a good deal of room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around color quality, and timing of imagery acquisition and delivery. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below. Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q1, "Was the imagery received by your office in time to be useful for crop compliance work?" Statistically, the highest scoring question was Q4, "Is the imagery useful for CLU maintenance?"

Q1		*Q2*		*Q3*		*Q4*		*Q5*	
Mean	2.72	Mean	3.163265306	Mean	3.837209302	Mean	4.041666667	Mean	3.904761905
Standard Error	0.185252172	Standard Error	0.121452864	Standard Error	0.114942484	Standard Error	0.09856386	Standard Error	0.135505779
Median	2	Median	3	Median	4	Median	4	Median	4
Mode	2	Mode	3	Mode	4	Mode	4	Mode	4
Standard Deviation	1.309930673	Standard Deviation	0.850170051	Standard Deviation	0.753728275	Standard Deviation	0.682870454	Standard Deviation	0.87817782
Sample Variance	1.715918367	Sample Variance	0.722789116	Sample Variance	0.568106312	Sample Variance	0.466312057	Sample Variance	0.771196283
Kurtosis	-0.910209886	Kurtosis	0.264178305	Kurtosis	0.22109	Kurtosis	-0.767179567	Kurtosis	-0.781196682
Skewness	0.43245365	Skewness	0.098750766	Skewness	-0.417645262	Skewness	-0.051807408	Skewness	-0.26204315
Range	4	Range	4	Range	3	Range	2	Range	3
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	3	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	136	Sum	155	Sum	165	Sum	194	Sum	164
Count	50	Count	49	Count	43	Count	48	Count	42

Q6		*Q7*		*Q8*		*Q9_X2*		*Q10_X2*	
Mean	3.770833333	Mean	3.171428571	Mean	3.645833333	Mean	6.28	Mean	5.625
Standard Error	0.149584482	Standard Error	0.251000399	Standard Error	0.150323479	Standard Error	0.352298575	Standard Error	0.360536686
Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	7	Median	6
Mode	4	Mode	4	Mode	4	Mode	8	Mode	8
Standard Deviation	1.036351689	Standard Deviation	1.484938388	Standard Deviation	1.041471613	Standard Deviation	2.491127112	Standard Deviation	2.497871434
Sample Variance	1.074024823	Sample Variance	2.205042017	Sample Variance	1.084663121	Sample Variance	6.205714286	Sample Variance	6.239361702
Kurtosis	0.407860221	Kurtosis	-1.224006107	Kurtosis	-0.970924757	Kurtosis	-0.750102667	Kurtosis	-1.130876451
Skewness	-0.712442415	Skewness	-0.42616571	Skewness	-0.40687493	Skewness	-0.605780633	Skewness	-0.107641966
Range	4	Range	4	Range	3	Range	8	Range	8
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	2	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	181	Sum	111	Sum	175	Sum	314	Sum	270
Count	48	Count	35	Count	48	Count	50	Count	48

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results